

# August 20, 2013 LUEAAC Agenda Item Comments

Comments on the Newport Beach Land Use Element Amendment Advisory Committee agenda from:

Jim Mosher ( [jimmosher@yahoo.com](mailto:jimmosher@yahoo.com) ), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

## 2) Approval of Minutes (August 6, 2013 Meeting)

The following minor corrections are suggested:

1. Page 1: “Members Present: ~~Edward Selich, Council Member (Chair)~~” (Ed was not at the meeting and is correctly listed a bit lower on the page under “Members Absent.”)
2. Page 2, under “Lido Village”: “... to be reconstructed ~~of~~ with pre-existing floor area and parking spaces ...”
3. Page 3:
  - a. Under “Congregate Care”: “Mr. Tescher ~~provided a summary~~ provided an overview and summary of ...”
  - b. Under “Public Comment on Non-Agendized Items”:
    - i. “Staff will ~~to~~ follow up with them directly.”
    - ii. “Public comments were heard both for and against ...”
  - c. Under “Adjournment”:
    - i. The date for posting of the agenda, given as “August 13, 2013,” could not possibly be correct, since that would be a week after the meeting. August 3 is also unlikely since that would be a Saturday. Possibly August 1 (the Thursday preceding the meeting) is meant?
    - ii. The reference to a “City Hall Bulletin Board” is not quite correct. The physical copy of the agenda is “posted” by placing it in a three-ring binder in the Council Chambers lobby. It is also displayed, along with other agendas, on an electronic screen in the lobby, although the latter is not yet fully functional.

## 3) Traffic Findings of Potential Land Use Change Areas

Is Location 5, where 1022 rooms of Visitor Serving Commercial are being proposed to be removed from “Newport Coast Hotel Rooms” in the Coastal Zone? If so, won’t this, by making the Newport Coast portion of the Coastal Zone increasingly available to permanent residents only, create a tremendous obstacle to a finding of consistency with the Coastal Act?

## 4) Other Area Updates

I find it interesting that according to the minutes and materials posted to date, only the possible inclusion of these few “add-on” amendments seems to have been thought controversial enough to require Issue Papers and deliberation by the Committee. Are staff’s original eight recommendations, including the huge Irvine Company proposals, thought to be of such obvious necessity and merit that any changes to them would be unthinkable? Or is discussion of those still to come?